

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 443

CE 058 513

AUTHOR Paris, Kathleen A.
TITLE Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy Program (WPL). Evaluation. 2nd Edition.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 107p.; Produced by the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy Program with the Wisconsin AFL-CIO and Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce. For a related training guide, see CE 058 512.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Adult Literacy; Basic Skills; *Job Development; *Job Skills; Peer Counseling; Postsecondary Education; *Program Evaluation; School Business Relationship; *Skill Development; Technical Institutes
IDENTIFIERS *Wisconsin; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

The Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy (WPL) Program provided job-specific basic skills education to employees at 11 worksites. A total of 1,441 employees were recruited to participate in on-site competency-based educational activities to upgrade their basic skills sufficiently for job retention or advancement. Participants were encouraged to continue their education. Blackhawk, Gateway, Mid-State, Milwaukee Area, and Waukesha County Technical Colleges were the local partners. The evaluation addressed two major questions: To what extent did the project attain its objectives? and What impact did the project have on participants and employers? The evaluation was conducted by gathering numerical data from the sites and interviewing 21 participants as well as company, union, college, and state agency representatives. Evaluation questions were grouped into two categories: 23 questions related to project objectives; and 6 questions related to participant outcomes. Three recommendations were highlighted: (1) Wisconsin should have a strategic plan for the development of workplace literacy programs; (2) the peer advisor feature should receive additional attention; and (3) program designs should consider after-school programs to raise the female participation rate. (Nine appendices are included: (1) partners' interview schedule; (2) participants' interview script and schedule; (3) informed consent form; (4) peer advisors' interview script and schedule; (5) state partners' interview schedule; (6) supervisors' interview schedule; (7) third-party evaluator schedule; (8) evaluation questions and data sources; and (9) summary of participant comments.) (NLA)

ED334443

EVALUATION

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM (WPL)

(PROJECT NUMBER V198A/O235)

GRANT FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ADMINISTERED BY THE WISCONSIN BOARD OF
VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

EVALUATOR

Kathleen A. Paris, Ph.D.
PARIS and ASSOCIATES
Madison, Wisconsin

2nd Edition

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OEI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. He matrix

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM IS FINANCED
PARTIALLY BY A GRANT FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE
AMOUNT OF \$393,569 (44%), WITH COMMITTED NON-FEDERAL MATCHING FUNDS OF
\$501,128 (56%), BRINGING THE TOTAL PROJECT RESOURCES TO \$894,697.

EXCEPT FOR THE RIGHTS RESERVED TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
THE WISCONSIN STATE AFL-CIO AND THE WISCONSIN MANUFACTURERS AND
COMMERCE, THE WISCONSIN BOARD OF VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL AND ADULT
EDUCATION RESERVES ALL RIGHTS TO THIS MATERIAL, AND THIS MATERIAL
CANNOT BE REPRODUCED NOR QUOTED FROM WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE
COPYRIGHT HOLDER.

COPYRIGHT © WISCONSIN BOARD OF VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL AND ADULT
EDUCATION, 1990.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE 058513

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	4
Design and Methodology	6
Evaluation Questions	10
Limitations	12
Interview Sites	14
Results of Participant Interviews	16
- Length of Participation	
- Ethnic Background, Gender and Age	
- Job Titles	
- Time Spent In Learning Center and On Homework	
- Attitude Toward Testing	
- Attitude Toward Instructor(s)	
- Contacts with Peer Advisors	
- How Participants Found Out About the Program	
- Motivation for Enrolling	
- Personal Goals for Participation	
- Subject Areas Worked On In Learning Center	
- Preferred Learning Methods	
- Needs for Child Care and Transportation	
Effects of Participation on Employees	24
Future Education Plans	29
Effects of WPL on the Organization As A Whole	30
Participant Likes and Dislikes	33
Local Partners' Views	34
- Measuring Program Benefits	
- Approaches that Work	
- Problems Experienced	
Peer Advisors' Views	37
State Partners' Views	40
- Program Strengths	
- Opportunities for Improvement	
- Information Dissemination	

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
Findings	43
- Part I: To What Extent Were Project Objectives Met?	
- Part II: Participant Outcomes	
Suggestions for Future Research	59
Commendations	60
Recommendations	61
Epilogue	62

APPENDICES

Local Partners Interview Schedule	A
Participants Interview Script and Schedule	B
Informed Consent Form	C
Peer Advisors Interview Script and Schedule	D
State Partners Interview Schedule	E
Supervisors Interview Schedule [Field Test Copy]	F
Third Party Evaluator Schedule	G
Evaluation Questions and Data Sources	H
Summary of Participant Comments	I

LIST OF TABLES

Table I: Effect of WPL Participation on Participant Job-Related Measures	26
Table II: Improvement in Basic Skills of Participants Who Studies the Subject Areas	27
Table III: Effects of WPL on Selected Organizational Factors	31

INTRODUCTION

The Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy (WPL) Program was developed to provide job-specific basic skills education to employees at eleven worksites in Wisconsin. The project was a cooperative effort between the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education (WBVTAE), Wisconsin State AFL-CIO and Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce (WMC) at the state level. At the local level, the partnership was between local Vocational Technical and Adult Education (VTAE) colleges, the unions or employee representatives and the employing companies.

Employees were recruited to participate in on-site competency-based educational activities designed to upgrade their skills in reading, verbal and written communication, listening, mathematics, reasoning and problem-solving, and use of the English language as those skills related to particular job classifications. Through related advising services provided by both peers and VTAE instructors, participants were encouraged to continue their education as appropriate in adult secondary education, customized training, or other career training offered by employers, participating technical colleges, or other educational institutions. The primary goal of the program was to increase the basic skill level of at least 1309 workers sufficiently for job retention and/or advancement and improved productivity.

The local partners as of January, 1990, are listed below according to VTAE partners.

1. Blackhawk Technical College

Beloit Corporation (Beloit) - International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Local 1197, International Molders and Allied Workers Union Local 320, and Patternmakers Association of Milwaukee

2. Gateway Technical College

American Brass (Kenosha) - United Steelworkers of America Local 9322 and
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Local 34
J.I. Case IH (Racine) - United Auto Workers Local 180

3. Mid-State Technical College

Joerns Healthcare, Inc. (Stevens Point) - United Steelworkers of America,
Upholsterers and Allied Industrial Division Local 333U
Ore-Ida Foods, Inc. (Plover) - Non-Union Employer
Schreiber Foods, Inc. (Wisconsin Rapids) - Non-Union Employer
Weyerhaeuser Company (Marshfield) - United Brotherhood of Carpenters and
Joiners of America Local 1733 and the United Paperworkers International
Union Local 696

4. Milwaukee Area Technical College

AC-Rochester - United Auto Workers Local 1866
Briggs and Stratton Corporation - Allied Industrial Workers Local 232
Miller Compressing Company - Allied Industrial Workers Local 364

5. Waukesha County Technical College

Navistar International Transportation Corporation (Waukesha) - United
Steelworkers of America Local 3740

The project was funded with federal Adult Education Act monies from the U.S. Department of Education and administered in Wisconsin by WBVTAE. The grant award was \$393,569 with committed matching funds of \$501,128, bringing the total project resources to \$894,697. The original grant extended from October 1, 1988 through December 31, 1989. Subsequently the Department of Education awarded the project a 90-day no-cost extension. Funding for the 90-day period

was provided by the WBVTAE through an Incentive Grant of \$43,305. A grant application for 1990-91 was also approved.

The evaluator was Kathleen A. Paris, Ph.D., President, PARIS and ASSOCIATES, Educational Services Division, Madison, Wisconsin, a management consulting firm which specializes in program planning and evaluation.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation addressed two major questions: "To what extent did the project attain its objectives?" and "What impact did the project have on participants and employers?" Answering these questions required a combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques. The quantitative aspects were based on numerical data submitted quarterly by all the sites. These data provided a great deal of information on the extent to which the project met its objectives.

To respond to those questions that are not readily addressed in the quarterly reports, three sites were studied in depth: the largest, the smallest, and one that fell in between in terms of number of participants. The sites visited by the evaluator included: Briggs and Stratton Corporation, Milwaukee, the largest program; Weyerhaeuser Company in Marshfield, a medium-sized site; and Miller Compressing Company, Milwaukee, the smallest program. The participant survey instrument was field-tested in January, 1990, with 3 participants and their supervisors at another WPL site, Navistar International Transportation Corporation in Waukesha. (Local partners were United Steelworkers Local 3740 and Waukesha County Technical College.) Based on the field

test, the participant survey was revised. The site visits took place between January and March, 1990.

At each site, the local partners which included representatives of the VTAE college, the union, and the employer were interviewed. The local partners interview schedule was developed directly from project objectives. The round table local partners interview attempted to elicit not only what occurred, but why certain activities succeeded or did not.

It is anticipated that the round table administrative interview schedule will be utilized in succeeding years as an on-going evaluation tool for the state project director during on-site visits. Project progress can then be monitored systematically. (See Appendix A, "Local Partners Interview Schedule.")

While on-site, the researcher interviewed program participants to determine their perceptions of the program's strengths and opportunities for improvement. In addition to open ended questions about program strengths and opportunities for improvement, participants were asked what effect, if any, the program had had on their own skills and on the organization. (See Appendix B, "Participants Interview Script and Schedule.") A total of 21 participants were interviewed from the three sites as follows:

Briggs and Stratton: 12 participants

Weyerhaeuser: 5 participants

Miller Compressing: 4 participants

Participants were selected on site for informal interviews of 30 minutes or less. Participants were made aware of the voluntary nature of the interview and were asked to sign affidavits to that effect. Prospective participants were also told that they would receive a pen in appreciation of giving of their time.

The original evaluation design called for the researcher to ask every Xth employee who came into the learning center to share his or her opinion of the program. This plan proved to be unworkable in that most of the participants arrived at the same time immediately following their shift. Thus the researcher attempted to randomize selection of those in the learning center by systematically selecting one individual from each table or learning station and continuing in a roughly clockwise fashion around the room.

It was originally anticipated that at the end of the interviews, the researcher would ask employees if she could contact their supervisors by mail to ask how participation in the program had helped. (See Appendix F, "Supervisors Interview Schedule" which is included for reference even though it was not used in this study.) Before this evaluation plan was finalized, however, the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO and several local partners voiced grave reservations about involving supervisors in the evaluation process in that employees had been guaranteed confidentiality. These partners felt it might cause apprehension among potential participants relative to the confidentiality of the program. (The researcher agreed that in view of the trepidation surrounding the supervisory survey, the decision of whether or not to utilize it in the evaluation process should be made locally.) Thus, in place of the

supervisory survey, a peer advisor survey was designed. The goal of the peer survey was to gather anecdotal information on how the program had affected employees. It was administered to a group of peer advisors at the sites. (Briggs and Stratton requested that only participants be interviewed, therefore the peer advisor survey was not administered at the site.) All peer advisors were asked to attend a one-hour session for completing the survey. (See Appendix D, "Peer Advisors Interview Script and Schedule.")

Prior to the site visit, the Project Director asked the learning center personnel to inform participants of the evaluator's visit to encourage students to participate in the interviews.

The Briggs and Stratton site visit, as an example, included these activities:

First day, morning	Local partners round table interview (approximately 2 hours)
Lunch	
First day, afternoon	Interviews with participants in learning center (educational center)
Second day	Complete interviews with participants and/or peer advisors

The Weyerhaeuser and Miller Compressing sites required only one day for local partners and participant interviews. (See Appendix G, "Third Party Evaluator Schedule.")

In summary, to answer the evaluation questions, three groups were interviewed at each of the three site visits: the local partners, a group which included representatives of the company, the union, and the VTAE college, including the

instructor(s); a non-probability sample of participants; and a non-probability sample of peer advisors. The Project Director was also interviewed as well as representatives of the state-level partnership. (See Appendix E, "State Partners Interview Schedule.") Project data collected through quarterly reports and intake/assessment forms were also utilized.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation questions were grouped into two categories, questions relative to project objectives and questions relative specifically to participant outcomes. See Appendix H for a list of evaluation questions with data sources.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Following are evaluation questions based on project objectives:

1. How effective are the local partnerships between the technical colleges, the employers, and the unions (or employee representatives)? (Objective 1)
2. How effective is the partnership at the state level between the WBVTAE, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce and Wisconsin State AFL-CIO? (Objective 1)
3. Were at least 620 union or employee representatives trained as peer advisors? (Objective 2)
4. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in training peer advisors? (Objective 2)
5. Did the VTAE instructors and support personnel receive adequate training? (Objective 3)
6. Were at least 387 job classifications assessed to identify the level of basic skills required? (Objective 4)

7. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in assessing the required number of job classifications? (Objective 4)
8. Were orientation activities held for at least 14,640 employees at their worksites? (Objective 5)
9. To what extent were participants made aware of all program services including peer advising, child care, transportation, and opportunities for additional education and skill training? (Objective 5)
10. Did at least 13,374 participants receive peer advisement? (Objective 6)
11. What factors contributed to success or lack of success in peer advising activities? (Objective 6)
12. Were at least 1,317 employees recruited into the project? (Objective 7)
13. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in recruiting participants? (Objective 7)
14. Were at least 1,237 participants assessed to determine competencies in reading, verbal and written communications, listening, math, reasoning, problem-solving, and use of the English language? (Objective 8)
15. Was basic skills instruction provided to at least 1,309 employees to retrain them for specific job classifications? (Objective 9)
16. To what extent was instruction individualized, mediated, competency-based and open-entry/open-exit? (Objective 9)
17. Did 61 non-English-speaking employees receive English-As-A-Second Language (ESL) instruction in reading and writing? (Objective 10)
18. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in providing ESL instruction? (Objective 10)

19. Did 545 employees prepare for the G.E.D. or engage in activities leading to an adult education diploma or receive career training from the employers, VTAE colleges or other institution? (Objective 11)
20. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in providing those additional educational opportunities for the projected number of participants? (Objective 11)
21. Was child care and transportation provided as requested? (Objective 12)
22. Was the project evaluated on the basis of its objectives? (Objective 13)
23. To what extent has information on the partnership been disseminated throughout labor, management and technical college organizations throughout the state? (Objective 14)

PARTICIPANT OUTCOMES

24. What benefits does the program provide the employing organization?
25. What benefits does the program provide for participating employees?
26. What were the demographic characteristics of participants in terms of age, sex, ethnicity, length of employment, highest level of education completed or educational functioning level?
27. What was the average number of hours of instruction per week per student?
28. What was the major impetus for enrolling in the program?
29. What were participants' major goals?

LIMITATIONS

The primary limitation of this study is the impossibility of interviewing a truly random sample of participants. Although a random sample could have been drawn from a list of participants, the individuals would have been available for interviews at sporadic times due to their work schedules. Discussions with project personnel indicated that locating and scheduling pre-selected participants was unworkable given the privacy assurances participants had received.

Complicating the issue of the non-probability sample was the fact that participants could not be selected according to the original design. (The plan was to interview every Xth participant who entered, but the impossibility of that was described earlier.) By selecting one participant from each table or work station and continuing in a roughly clockwise fashion around the room, the researcher attempted to avoid systematic variation in the sample. Although this did not necessarily result in a random sample, it was a sincere effort to obtain a sample of "typical" participants.

To address this problem, learning center personnel were asked to verify that the times selected for the on-site interviews were "typical." That is, they were asked if there was anything about that time period that was somehow different from the norm. Learning center personnel indicated that they felt the selected times were "typical". Thus the researcher does not feel there is systematic variation between the group of participants interviewed and a purely random group that might have been selected using, for instance, a random numbers table. This procedure does limit the data to those who are still active in the WPL program. Thus it excludes those who enrolled but no longer attend.

Second, some self-selection bias was anticipated in that participants in the learning centers were asked whether they would participate in the interview. Interestingly, however, no participant declined to be interviewed. Thus, at least in terms of willingness to participate in the research, self-selection bias did not appear to be a problem.

Third, the largest and the smallest project sites were selected for study, resulting in two sites, Briggs and Stratton and Miller Compressing, that shared the same VTAE partner -- Milwaukee Area Technical College. While this could be problematic in terms of generalizing results, three factors, in the researcher's opinion, mitigated the potential biasing effect. First, MATC had, in fact, served more employees through the WPL program than any other single VTAE district. This was primarily due to the size of the Briggs and Stratton project (184 in September, 1989). Second, the VTAE college was but one partner along with the employer and the local unions or employee groups. Thus, variation would have been seen among the two sites in spite of their being served by the same VTAE college. Finally, the Weyerhaeuser site, served by Mid-State Technical College, provided additional variation as well.

"Suggestions for Future Research", the researcher suggests that project longevity should be part of the criteria for selecting evaluation sites. It is difficult to judge effectiveness based on less than nine months of operation.

INTERVIEW SITES

Briggs and Stratton Corporation, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is the well-known producer of small gas engines. Though Briggs and Stratton is widely known for providing engines for lawn and garden equipment, the company also produces engines and equipment for industrial applications. The largest of the WPL sites, Briggs and Stratton had approximately 7,204 employees as of September 30, 1989, with 486 participating in the WPL as of December 31, 1989. The Union is Allied Industrial Workers (AIW-AFL-CIO) - Local 232.

The Briggs and Stratton WPL program began in January, 1989, and has 6 instructors. Participants are not paid for enrolling and attend on their "own" time.

Miller Compressing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, is in the business of shearing, shredding, crushing and hydraulically compressing scrap iron, steel, nonferrous metals and alloys. The company processes discarded metals into new forms to be recycled by steel mills, foundries and smelters throughout the Midwest and overseas. Begun in 1903, Miller is a family-owned company with 305 employees (September 30, 1989). As of December 31, 1989, 13 were participating in WPL. Employees struck in February, 1990. The researcher visited the site after the settlement in March, 1990. The strike appeared to have had little or no impact on the Learning Center other than the stoppage of activity for the duration of the strike. The Union is Allied Industrial Workers Local 1733.

The Miller Compressing WPL program began in August, 1989, and has 1 instructor. Participants receive no pay for enrolling and may, in fact, opt to lose pay for participating. Employees are allowed to leave their shift 1 1/2 hours early to attend the Learning Center or attend before or after their shift.

The Weyerhaeuser Company in Marshfield, Wisconsin, is the world's largest manufacturer of architectural doors and a producer of composite products. FORTUNE magazine cited it as one of the "best 100" companies to work for. The unions at Weyerhaeuser are the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners

Local 1733 and the United Paperworkers International Local 696. Of the 800 Weyerhaeuser employees in Marshfield (September 30, 1989), 111 had participated in the WPL program as of December 31, 1989.

The Weyerhaeuser WPL program began in September, 1988, and has 1 instructor. The researcher conducted interviews of the architectural door plant participants, peer advisors and local partners.

The Marshfield door facility was purchased in 1960. Weyerhaeuser doors are used in schools, hospitals, office buildings, hotels and motels, and are sold throughout the U.S. and Canada.

Participants at the architectural door plant are paid half their hourly wage for every hour spent in the Education Center. Employees are limited to no more than 8 hours worth of pay per month, although they may attend as many hours as they wish.

RESULTS OF PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

LENGTH OF PARTICIPATION

The researcher interviewed 21 participants from 3 WPL sites. Eleven, or over half, said they had participated more than six months. For that group the average was eleven months, or close to one year, of participation.

Following is a summary of length of participation:

<u>Length of Participation</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
1 month or less	3
More than 1 month, less than 3	4
More than 3 months, less than 6	3
More than 6 months	11

ETHNIC BACKGROUND, GENDER, AND AGE

The majority, fifteen, reported being "White/Not Hispanic Origin". Three reported being "Black/Not Hispanic Origin" and 3 reported being "Hispanic". Fourteen, or two thirds, were over age forty. Following are the numbers and age categories:

<u>Age Intervals</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
Age 18-29	1 participant
Age 30-39	6 participants
Age 40-49	9 participants
Age 50-59	5 participants

Not surprisingly, none were under eighteen or over sixty. Fourteen, or two thirds, of those interviewed were male. The demographic characteristics of the sample group, in terms of ethnicity, sex, and age, appeared to be similar to those of the total group. (See Findings: Part II Participant Outcomes.)

JOB TITLES

Participants reported their job titles as follows:

Assembler (2)
Clipper Operator (1)
Engine Repair (1)
Machine Operator (3)
Pan Liner (1)
Pieceworker (5)
Pipefitter (1)

Quality Operator (1)

Rerailer (1)

Set-Up (1)

Shaker (1)

Sorter (1)

Watch Operator (1)

Don't Know (1)

TIME SPENT IN THE LEARNING CENTER AND ON HOMEWORK

Fourteen, or two thirds, said they spent up to or over 4 hours weekly in the Learning Center. Of the remaining 7, 5 spent between 1-2 hours and 2 spent up to 3 hours.

Over two-thirds, or 15, said that amount of time was "about right". Six said it was "not enough". (See question 7, Appendix I.)

Homework is not mandatory, but participants may take materials home to work on them. The amount of time reportedly spent on homework varied, although 8 of 21 reported having no homework. Following are the number of hours of weekly homework reported by the 13 who said they had homework:

<u>Hours Spent Weekly On Homework</u>	<u>Participants Reporting Homework</u>
One hour or less	1
1-2 hours	4
Up to 3 hours	2
Up to 4 hours	3
More than 4 hours	3

Nine, the majority of the 13, said the amount of time spent was "about right" with 3 reporting it was "not enough" and one responding "don't know". (See question 8, Appendix I.)

ATTITUDE TOWARD TESTING

Concerns had been raised earlier in development of the WPL program that participants might be overwhelmed with tests administered to establish their base lines. Participants interviewed did not report the amount of testing to be a problem. In fact, the majority, 16, said the amount of testing was "about right". Two said it was "not enough" and only 1 said it was "too much". Two said they had not been tested.

The majority, 16, felt the tests were "fair". No one said they were unfair. The remaining responses were "no response" due to limited English or were "not applicable" due to not having been tested.

ATTITUDE TOWARD INSTRUCTOR(S)

The great majority, 19, described the instructor as "easy to understand". One did not respond due to limited English proficiency. (See comments under questions 20 and 21 in Appendix I.)

CONTACTS WITH PEER ADVISORS

Almost two thirds, 13, said they had not had contacts with peer advisors. In all 13 cases, the researcher attempted to clarify that peer advisors were union people who told employees about the Learning Center. This was to ensure that the term was understood. It is possible that, with the passage of time, respondents did not recall earlier contacts with peer advisors. Of the 8 who reported contacts, 3 said the contacts were "very helpful", 4 said they were "helpful", and one said they were "somewhat helpful". It was clear that peer advisors' personal contacts were considered very positive.

One participant who reported contact with a peer advisor said, "It helps that she's in the program to recruit others". Another reported that the peer advisor talked to "everyone in the shop". (See question 23 in Appendix I.)

HOW PARTICIPANTS FOUND OUT ABOUT THE PROGRAM

The most frequent response to the question, "How did you find out about the program?" was through printed materials such as flyers or articles in the union paper. A promotional strategy that appeared to be effective was enclosing information with employee paychecks. Bulletin board postings were also cited. Of 24 responses to this open-ended question, 10 cited printed materials.

Seven of the 24 responses indicated that participants had found out about the program through a union representative or union meeting. (See question 24, Appendix I.) Note that participants could select more than one response.

MOTIVATION FOR ENROLLING

Respondents were asked what factor(s) had the most effect on their deciding to enroll. Most cited two or three factors. Following is a summary of responses to this forced-choice question.

<u>Factors That Had the Effect On Decision to Enroll</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
Open house	6
Peer advisor	5
Printed publication	5
Family member suggestion	4
Employer referral	1
Another training program	0
Other	4

Among the 4 "other" responses were: friend; another participant; co-worker; and own desire.

PERSONAL GOALS FOR PARTICIPATION

Respondents were asked what their goals were for enrolling. Following are their responses:

<u>Participants Goals</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
Improve math skills	19
Improve self-image	18
Improve writing skills	15
Improve reading skills	15
Retain job	14
Do better at current job	14
Receive a promotion	12
Improve spoken communications skills	10
Transfer to different job	7
Other	13

Among the "other" responses were: computers (4); typing (2); spelling (2); self-improvement (2); improve communication (1); gauges (1); G.E.D. (1).

The vast majority, however, were motivated by the opportunity to improve math skills and their self-image. That was closely followed by a desire to improve reading and writing skills.

Two thirds, 14, said they enrolled to retain or improve in their current jobs. Over half, 12, said they were interested in a promotion.

SUBJECT AREAS WORKED ON IN LEARNING CENTER

Respondents were asked which areas they had worked on in the Learning Center.

Their answers ranged as follows.

<u>Subject Areas Worked On</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
Math skills	15
Reading skills	14
Writing skills	12
Computer literacy skills	12
English language skills	9
Spoken communication skills	6
GED preparation	1
Other	8

"Other" responses were: blueprint reading (3); gauges (3); micrometers (1); and spelling (1).

Respondents, therefore, appear to be receiving the kinds of instruction they enrolled for. Although computer skills were mentioned as an initial goal by only 4, in fact, over half, 12, have received instruction in computer literacy.

PREFERRED LEARNING METHODS

Respondents were asked what learning method(s) they liked best. Following is a summary of their responses.

<u>Learning Method</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
One-on-one with teacher	19
Small group discussions	10
6-8 week group classes	4
Computer-based	4
Video	3
Don't know	1

In the total group results, one-on-one with the teacher was overwhelmingly favored. The aggregate results are misleading, however, in that the Miller and Weyerhaeuser sites, did not, at the time of the study, provide small group discussions. Instruction was primarily through one-on-one with the instructor or individualized work on the computer (at Miller).

At the Briggs and Stratton site, instruction was delivered both one-on-one and in small groups. Responses of Briggs and Stratton participants show that small group discussions were preferred almost as much as one-on-one with the teacher. ("One-on-one," 11, "small group discussions," 8.) As one teacher commented, participants are accustomed to working in small groups in their work sites. Also, it enables them to learn from each other. Some students, according to another instructor, need the structure of a small group. Therefore, it would seem optimal to provide learning opportunities in the small group mode as well as in the one-on-one with instructor mode.

NEEDS FOR CHILD CARE AND TRANSPORTATION

All of the respondents said they did not need child care or transportation. While the need does not appear to exist among those who attend, it is not known whether the need for child care and/or transportation precludes participation of others.

One site reported that child care does, in fact, make it difficult for women to participate. However, "child care" as they defined it, was not care of infants and toddlers, but rather the need to be home when children return from school. The availability of child care and transportation funds was posted at all three sites.

EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION ON EMPLOYEES

Participants were asked how much they felt that going to the Learning Center had improved various aspects of their job performance. Results are summarized in Table I. Note that participants gave "not applicable" responses for one of two reasons -- either the measures were never problematic for them or they did not see a relationship between the measures and WPL participation.

Almost two-thirds (13, or 62%) said that enrolling in the WPL program had improved relationships with other employees either "a lot" (4) or "some" (9). Respondents' comments as to why the improvement occurred are illuminating:

- Because I talk more.
- I speak better.
- I get along with people better. Before going to school, things people would say bothered me. Now I overlook it.
- I seem to be more talkative, more open. I can express myself more. I was a shy kid.
- I understand more what inspectors are saying and I understand more about the gauges.
- When someone asks me how to spell something, I'm not afraid to bring it out. Before I'd try to get around even trying it.
- Before they knew things I didn't. Now you don't feel like you're so dumb.
- It's helped a lot when a math problem comes up you can help your fellow workers.
- You feel accomplished. You find out where your base is and you're not as dumb as you thought. I like it that they test you and start you where you need to begin.

As the comments suggest, participation in WPL seems to help workers communicate more freely with one another and to work together more readily. Thus, the WPL appears to enhance teamwork among employees.

What about relationships with supervisors? Nine, or 43%, or close to half, said WPL had improved their relationships with supervisors either "a lot" (3 or 14%) or "some" (6 or 29%). Conversely, 5, or 24%, reported no improvement. Again, their comments are enlightening.

- I'm more aggressive in speaking to them [supervisors]. I used to be more of a spectator. Now I'm more self-confident. I go up to them and say 'hi'. Before I would stay out of their way. I was just another number.
- They appreciate their people trying to get ahead.
- It brings you out.
- I don't think my supervisor knows. In a factory, you're just a number. My foreman was proud of me for going here.
- I get along with them a little bit better. I don't get in arguments.
- I'm not afraid to say if something is wrong. I use my brain for thinking more. I used to say, 'Let it go'.
- They ask me about what I'm learning. Before they couldn't care less.

Their comments would indicate that for a significant group of participants, almost half, the program helps break down barriers between themselves and their supervisors through greater communication.

TABLE I

EFFECT OF WPL PARTICIPATION ON PARTICIPANT JOB-RELATED MEASURES

OCTOBER 1, 1988 - MARCH 31, 1990

	: IMPROVED : : A LOT :		: IMPROVED : : SOME :		: IMPROVED : : A LITTLE :		: NO : : IMPROVEMENT :		: DON'T : : KNOW :		: NOT : : APPLICABLE :		: NO : : RESPONSE :		: TOTALS	
EMPLOYEE JOB-RELATED MEASURES	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	% *
a. Relationships with other employees?	(4)	19	(9)	43	(1)	5	(3)	14	---	--	(2)	10	(2)	10	21	101
b. Relationships with your supervisors?	(3)	14	(6)	29	(1)	5	(5)	24	---	--	(4)	19	(2)	10	21	101
c. Productivity on the job?	(4)	19	(3)	14	(1)	5	(1)	5	---	--	(10)	48	(2)	10	21	101
d. Safety on the job?	(2)	10	(2)	10	---	--	(1)	5	---	--	(14)	67	(2)	10	21	102
e. Promotability?	(5)	24	(5)	24	(4)	19	(3)	14	(1)	5	(1)	5	(2)	10	21	101
f. Attendance at work?	---	--	---	--	---	--	(1)	5	---	--	(18)	86	(2)	10	21	101
g. Satisfaction with your job?	(5)	24	(2)	10	---	--	(4)	19	---	--	(8)	38	(2)	10	21	101
h. Quality of work?	(3)	14	(4)	19	---	--	(2)	10	---	--	(8)	38	(4)	19	21	100
i. Math skills?	(8)	38	(3)	14	(1)	5	(1)	5	---	--	(6)	29	(2)	10	21	101
j. Reading skills?	(7)	33	(2)	10	(1)	5	---	--	---	--	(9)	43	(2)	10	21	101
k. Writing skills?	(5)	24	(3)	14	(2)	10	---	--	---	--	(9)	43	(2)	10	21	101
l. Ability to use computers?	(6)	29	(3)	14	(1)	5	(1)	5	---	--	(8)	38	(2)	10	21	101
m. Ability to communicate by speaking?	(6)	29	(2)	10	(1)	5	(1)	5	---	--	(9)	43	(2)	10	21	102
n. Ability to solve problems?	(4)	19	(5)	24	(3)	14	(1)	5	---	--	(6)	29	(2)	10	21	101

* Totals exceed 100% due to rounding.

Eleven, over half (52%), said the participation had improved their math skills "a lot" (8 or 38%) or "some" (3 or 14%). Just under half also reported "a lot" or "some" improvement in reading and writing skills. These figures under-represent the actual percentage of improvement in that a significant number of respondents either did not study these areas or did not respond to the questions. Table II shows the percentages of improvement including only those who actually studied the subjects.

TABLE II

Improvement in Basic Skills of Participants Who Studied the Subject Areas

<u>Area of Study</u>	<u>Improved A Lot</u>		<u>Improved Some</u>		<u>Improved A Little</u>		<u>No Improvement</u>		<u>Totals *</u>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Math skills	(8)	62	(3)	23	(1)	8	(1)	8	13	101
Reading skills	(7)	70	(2)	20	(1)	10	--	--	10	100
Writing skills	(5)	50	(3)	30	(2)	20	--	--	10	100
Speaking skills	(6)	60	(2)	20	(1)	10	(1)	10	10	100
Ability to Use Comp.	(6)	55	(3)	27	(1)	9	(1)	9	11	100
Problem Solving	(4)	31	(5)	38	(3)	23	(1)	8	13	100

* Totals may exceed 100% due to rounding.

Thus, the great majority who reported studying math, reading, writing, speaking, computer, or problem-solving skills reported "a lot" or "some" improvement. Few reported "a little" or "no" improvement.

Referring again to Table I, it can be seen that ten, or 48%, said they felt that participation had increased their promotability either "a lot" (5 or 24%) or "some" (5 or 24%). In a separate question related to promotability, 5 or 24%, said they thought they would be promoted if a job opening existed. Four, or 19%, said they did not think they would be promoted. Nine, or 43%, said they did not know. (Other responses were: not applicable, 2; and no response, 1.)

One third (7) reported their productivity had increased "a lot" or "some". Almost half said it was "not applicable". The researcher's interpretation was that many participants' understanding of the meaning of "productivity" was fuzzy.

Quality of work was reported improved "a lot" or "some" by 7 or one-third, with an almost equal number reporting "not applicable".

Seven, or one-third, said participation increased their job satisfaction "a lot" or "some". An almost equal number reported that WPL was "not applicable" to job satisfaction.

Safety on the job was considered "not applicable" by the majority of participants (14, or 67%). Attendance was also considered "not applicable" by the majority (18, or 86%) as most said they had maintained a good attendance record previously.

In summary, employees as a group reported their greatest gains to be in relationships with other employees, math, promotability, relationships with supervisors, and problem-solving ability. The great majority of employees who studied math, reading, writing, spoken communication, computers, or problem-solving reported "a lot" or "some" improvement in those areas. (See Tables I and II.)

When participants were asked how much WPL had helped them "over all" in their jobs, the majority said either "a lot" (7, or 33%) or "some" (6, or 29%). Two (10%) reported that WPL helped "a little" and 2 (10%) reported it was of no help in their jobs. (Remaining answers were: don't know, 2; not applicable, 1; or no response, 1.)

Interestingly, respondents reported overwhelmingly that participation in WPL had helped them in their personal lives "a lot" (11 or 52%) or "some" (4 or 19%). Four or 19% said it had helped them in their personal lives "little or none". Other responses were: don't know, 1; and no response, 1. Comments indicated that it had been most helpful in consumer matters and in helping children with schoolwork. (See question 18, Appendix I.)

FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PLANS

Participants were asked if they plan to enroll in other training programs. Two reported that they had already enrolled in or taken additional training, and 6 said they planned to do so. About half, 10, said they did not plan to enroll in other training. Three were undecided. All 8 who either planned to or who

had taken additional coursework reported the local VTAE college as the institution of choice. Below are the additional programs participants cited.

(Some respondents gave more than one answer.)

Blueprint Reading (3)

Computers (1)

CNC (1)

Drafting (1)

Electrical, Basic (1)

First Aid (1)

Inspection, Basic (1)

Inspection, Advanced (1)

Machinist (1)

Math (2)

More Reading and Spelling, etc. (1)

Power Fluid (1)

Welding (2)

Word Processing (1)

Thus, of the 18 who expressed an opinion, respondents were split almost evenly on the question of additional training.

EFFECTS OF WPL ON THE ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE

Participants were asked how much they felt WPL had helped improve 6 organizational factors - morale, productivity, safety, quality, and relationships with supervisors and other employees. Results are summarized in Table III.

TABLE III

EFFECTS OF WPL ON SELECTED ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

	: IMPROVED : : A LOT :		: IMPROVED : : SOME :		: IMPROVED : : A LITTLE :		: NO : : IMPROVEMENT :		: DON'T : : KNOW :		: NOT : : APPLICABLE :		: NO : : RESPONSE :		: TOTALS :	
ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	% *
Morale	(4)	19	(5)	24	(1)	5	(1)	5	(6)	29	---	--	(4)	19	(21)	101
Productivity	(3)	14	(5)	24	(2)	10	---	--	(6)	29	(1)	5	(4)	19	(21)	101
Safety	---	--	(3)	14	(2)	10	---	--	(6)	29	(6)	29	(4)	19	(21)	101
Quality	(4)	19	(3)	14	(1)	5	---	--	(8)	38	(1)	5	(4)	19	(21)	100
Relationships With Supervisors	(1)	5	(6)	29	(3)	14	(1)	5	(5)	24	(1)	5	(4)	19	(21)	101
Relationships Between Employees	(4)	19	(3)	14	(2)	10	---	--	(6)	29	(2)	10	(4)	19	(21)	101

* Totals may exceed 100% due to rounding.

Almost half (9, or 43%) felt morale had improved either "a lot" or "some". Roughly one-third reported "a lot" or "some" improvement in productivity, quality and relationships with supervisors and other employees. This question, not surprisingly, received a high percentage of "don't know" and "not applicable" responses as well as no response. When only those who stated an opinion are counted, three quarters or more reported "a lot" or "some" improvement in morale, productivity, quality, and relationships between employees. Two thirds of that group reported "a lot" or "some" improvement in relationships with supervisors.

Participants were also asked an open-ended question, "What benefits does your employer get from your being in the program?" Two-thirds (14) cited specific benefits to their employer. Most of the remaining 7 did not know. Only 1 cited "no benefit" to his employer. The majority responded with answers that support increased productivity and quality. Only one mentioned increased safety. Examples of responses include:

- * Better quality work.
- * Fewer mistakes. I understand what I'm doing more. Helps control waste. Make the product right the first time around.
- * [Now] maybe I can handle the job better and in the future also. Better quality and productivity - it all goes together.
- * [The company] can only benefit greatly by having people learn. It all helps the life at the factory.
- * [The company gets] better work out of me. I solve more of my own problems; am more conscientious of the work I do.
- * My knowledge will help on my job, I'll give them 100%. (See question 19, Appendix I.)

In summary, participants suggested in their own words that improved quality and productivity were the major benefits accruing to the employer from WPL improvement.

PARTICIPANT LIKES AND DISLIKES

The instructor and the individual attention offered by the instructor, and the convenience of the site, were the factors cited most frequently when participants were asked what they liked most.

Other factors cited frequently were self-paced learning and the pride of accomplishment.

Variety of offerings and working in the Learning Center with friends were also cited as positive aspects of the program. (See question 29, Appendix I.)

Only six of the respondents offered any substantial dislikes when asked, "What do you like least about the Learning Center?" Five of the six were at one site. The major issues identified for the site were insufficient numbers of computers and insufficient numbers of teachers for one-on-one instruction. In addition, one participant cited, "Lack of communication between teacher and students - I've come 2 weeks in a row expecting to have class. There's no teacher [again today]."

Noise levels due to various learning activities being carried on simultaneously were cited several times as a problem.

For the most part, the few problems identified were related to demand for teachers and computers that exceeded available resources. Participants who voiced the concerns seemed genuinely frustrated.

LOCAL PARTNERS' VIEWS

Measuring Program Benefits

At all three sites the researcher interviewed representatives of the company, the union, and the technical college. Results of the round table interviews are reported in "Findings". In addition to the formal evaluation question, the researcher asked the local partners how the benefits of the program could be measured.

The barriers to quantifiable measurement include: confidentiality of participation which makes it difficult to question supervisors about participants' progress; the open entry/open exit feature of the program which makes it difficult to post-test people; the fact that so many variables in addition to the program impact on employee attitudes and behaviors.

One measurement that is feasible is the percent of employees who subsequently pass a qualifying test for a higher position after first having failed and then attending the Learning Center. This would be effective only in organizations with vertical job classifications and a structured testing program.

An approach to helping ensure that participants complete post tests might be offering incentives for them to do so, such as points toward gift items or "raffle" tickets.

It was suggested that participants should regularly be asked in a formal way if the program is meeting their needs.

Finally, an organizational climate study prior to program initiation and at regular intervals can give an indication of how the program is affecting the culture of the organization. Intervening factors such as layoffs, pay or contract disputes, business downturns and other problems would need to be taken into consideration.

Regarding the measurement issue, a peer advisor said, "I believe the caring/nurturing instructor we have is the reason for our success. When management views this as a cost/benefit program, they will never be able to measure its success appropriately. How can you say a mistake didn't happen because now someone has a command of the English language?"

A peer advisor at the other site said, "I don't think the government can understand how important this program has been to people."

Approaches That Work

The local partner interviews yielded information that was very useful even though it did not all relate to an evaluation question. Following are some of those findings:

1. Programs should start small to maintain quality and ensure that participants are successful.

2. Programs should provide a range of offerings, including some job-specific skills such as gauging and not merely the lower levels of basic skills. This helps lessen employees' fears of being labeled.
3. Participants need tangible reinforcement for their learning accomplishments. Besides certificates of completion, company jackets or gift certificates for other company products might be offered.
4. Reading activities should include plant safety signs and/or manuals as well as the in-house newsletter.
5. Instructors must be willing and able to treat participants with respect and as adults. Many employees have had negative experiences with teachers and education that have remained with them through their adult lives. In addition, the teacher must be the right teacher for that company as the needs of the sites vary considerably.
6. Communication mailings from any of the participating entities about the site should routinely go to all the partners. The practice ensures that all have equal access to information.
7. Provide both one-on-one with the teacher and small group workshops. Many people need the structure of the small group as well as the individual attention.

Problems Experienced

The greatest problem reported by the local partners was the project's requirement for data collection. Due to the lack of a VTAE state project director for some months after inception, sites were unaware of reporting requirements. As a result, instructors had to back-track to gather information on participants. Some of the participants were no longer employed with the

company. While that problem seems to have been resolved, what one partner calls "onerous reporting requirements" still is considered a problem. Instructors are called upon to gather the data and most reported that, especially in the absence of clerical help, it was a great burden.

One partner reported that the time commitment for the VTAE administrator in charge of the program is also very great. The individual felt that the time commitment required to "shepherd" the program was not made known at the beginning.

Local partners attached various meaning to the terms "orienting," "providing peer advising" and "recruitment." For example, one site considered telling large groups about the program to be "orienting," while "orienting" to another meant one-on-one orientation to using the Center. The latter considered telling large groups about the program to be "recruitment." Thus, the terms, if utilized again in the future, should be operationally defined for all sites to help ensure that reliable data are generated.

Finally, one local partner complained, "The federal design doesn't seem to be aware of how business changes. For us, how plant layoffs affected the program...we had to close down the whole shift."

PEER ADVISORS' VIEWS

The researcher interviewed six peer advisors, three each from the Miller and Weyerhaeuser sites. (See "Design and Methodology.") In addition to participating in the group interviews, each of the six completed a written survey instrument, results of which are found in the Appendices.

The majority agreed that the following elements of the WPL program were "very important" or "important": learning on-site; confidential instruction; individualized instruction; group workshops or group instruction; peer advisors; work related instruction; and voluntary participation.

As a group, they agreed that the benefits to the organization were more knowledgeable employees and workers better able to work together and with supervisors.

The group agreed that the major benefit to participants was the opportunity for job advancement and secondarily, the improved ability to communicate with co-workers and management. An example of the latter benefit described by a peer advisor is, "...less fear in initiating a conversation because of a language barrier."

Relative to job advancement, one peer advisor said, "I know 2 people who told me they may not have the job they do now if they had not gone to class to brush up before taking the test for the job advancement." How did the program help specifically? "The people were able to read the questions and understand them and were better equipped to do the math problems."

At the other site, a peer advisor said, "I have observed some of the employees have been promoted just by being in the program..."

Another described this success story: "A man that is 55 years old who could not read. But can read now because of the learning center. He can do more things for himself without asking someone to read it to him."

No major problems resulting from the program for employees were cited. Fatigue, the need for more class subjects [such as blueprint reading, computers, public speaking], and the need to have someone pick up participants' children from school were mentioned. At the Miller site, one peer advisor said, "Getting used to working shorter hours is a little hard because of the wages, but they seem to stick with it."

The need to get more employees involved was cited by several peer advisors. One said, "...I feel some people who could really use it are not participating. The ones who are, are not the ones who really, really need the help."

They agreed that fear and embarrassment were the major barriers to participation. None of the six cited any problems for the organization as a result of the program, although one said this in response to that question: "Lack of dedication by peer advisors to go the extra step to get people involved. The success of a few hard working individuals is carrying the weight so many others could help with."

Five of the six had served as a peer advisor for at least six months. (One did not respond.)

STATE PARTNERS' VIEWS

Program Strengths

The researcher interviewed state-level representatives of the AFL-CIO, Wisconsin Board of VTAE, and Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce to garner their perceptions of the effectiveness of the partnership at their level. All partners agreed that the partnership itself was a major strength of the program. As a representative of the AFL-CIO said, "The program couldn't exist without [the partnership]. If any one of us tried to do it alone, we couldn't. [In the WPL program] we are all doing what we do best." A representative of Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce cited the uniqueness of that organization and the AFL-CIO "working together toward a common goal."

Two of the three saw the capacity to tailor each WPL site to the needs of the workers and the company as a strength. One partner described the program's strength as its "...end result - workers better qualified, employees happy to have a chance to learn, companies that are more efficient."

Two of the three state partners indicated that WBVTAE leadership had been lacking early in the project, but had improved markedly with the hiring of the current project director. (The project which began in October 1988 had a director only briefly, between February and May, 1989. The current project director began in June, 1989.)

Opportunities for Improvement

The state-level respondents were asked what opportunities they saw for improving the program. The need for program expansion was agreed upon by all

three partners -- adding new sites, involving more technical colleges, and enhancing promotional strategies to fill existing programs to capacity. Other areas of agreement by at least two of the three partners fell under the need for: a broader curriculum; more on-site evaluation and maintenance of a track record of success; improved communication among the state level partners; and an enhanced peer advisor program.

In terms of a broader curriculum, one suggested closer integration with existing VTAE services or programs such that, for example, VTAE "Pre-Tech" or "Pre-SPC" courses might be offered at the site to prepare people for VTAE courses. (VTAE counselors might also be more involved at the site.) Such a linkage would require a corporate training plan that would include courses to be offered over the next several years.

Another respondent said the program must look beyond the basics to specific job skills as well. "Get the workers involved in specific job training while they are part of the [WPL] program." For that to happen, the respondent said, some VTAE colleges have to continue to be more responsive to the needs of businesses. "Some of the [VTAE] colleges are open to change. Some of the others, you have to push them all the time...Companies need to be able to say 'this is what we need' and get it."

In terms of evaluation, one suggested increased use of round table discussions such as the format utilized in this design. Another pointed out that the program is only two years old and should be evaluated in terms of longer as

well as shorter term gains. Comments offered relative to the need for improved communication at the state level reflected the fact that since the Wisconsin Board of VTAE is the grant recipient, their staff have access to the most information the fastest. Thus, even though the entities function as a partnership, a certain unevenness is built-in. One respondent said, "We must continue to build the partnership. We must continue to work at a better balance of sharing."

To enhance the peer advisor program, respondents suggested that more training be provided to peer advisors so they can be more effective in recruitment activities. It was suggested that the peer advisors be involved in more on-going dissemination activities. One suggested that the role of the peer advisor be expanded from an "information distributor" to a "para-advisor" who would counsel people to go in the first place, but would also stay in contact after workers are enrolled to provide on-going support.

Other opportunities for improvement cited include:

- More staff development.
- A stronger link between job analysis and curriculum design.
- Development of advisory committees for each site.

Information Dissemination

State level partners disseminated information on WPL chiefly through conference presentations and news articles. Following are some of the conferences at which state level WPL representatives discussed the program:

- AFL-CIO State Community Services Conference, Lake Geneva, 1990 and Appleton, 1989.
- Wisconsin Vocational Association, Stevens Point, 1990.
- Central Labor Council Conference, 1989.
- AFL-CIO National Community Services Conference, Washington, D.C., 1989.

Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce placed an article in ALLIANCE, their publication to the educational community, and included articles in five WMC newsletters.

FINDINGS

This study posed 29 questions that were grouped into two categories. Part I includes questions directly tied to project objectives. Part II includes questions relative to participant outcomes.

PART I: TO WHAT EXTENT WERE PROJECT OBJECTIVES MET?

1. How effective are the local partnerships between the technical colleges, the employers, and the unions (or employee representatives)? (Objective 1)

Partnerships at the local level appear to be very effective. This was true of the three sites visited. One partner said, "on a scale of one to ten, I'd give [the partnership] a 15...we really do understand each other."

When partners were interviewed, they consistently referred to the mutual involvement and commitment of the three players as a major contributor to the success of WPL. One partner cautioned that it may take some time for the trust level to develop. He said that at first, suspicion levels were high all around.

2. How effective is the partnership at the state level between the WBVTAE, Wisconsin Association of Manufacturers and Commerce and the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO? (Objective 1)

The partnership at the state level also appears to be effective. Those interviewed at the state level expressed the same sentiment as the local partners that the mutuality is the key success ingredient. One partner said, "The program couldn't exist without [the partnership]. If any one of us tried to do it alone, we couldn't. [In the WPL program] we are all doing what we do best." The only difficulty reported was the occasional disequilibrium resulting from the fact that one of the partners is the grant recipient. One partner said, "We must continue to build the partnership. We must continue to work at a better balance of sharing."

3. Were at least 620 union or employee representatives trained as peer advisors? (Objective 2)

No. As of March 31, 1990, 448 peer advisors were trained, according to project records.

4. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in training peer advisors? (Objective 2)

Following are approaches to peer advisor training that local partners felt were successful:

1. Include all partners in the training sessions.
2. Include foremen in the peer advisor training sessions even though they are not necessarily involved in one-on-one advising. This leads to shared understanding of the program.
3. Provide periodical on-going training sessions to update current peer advisors and introduce new ones. Keeping peer advisors informed on a continuing basis helps them be more effective promoters.
4. Include role-playing opportunities in the training sessions so peer advisors can practice discussing the program with potential participants.
5. Provide a notebook or other references to not only help peer advisors organize their information and stay current, but also to reinforce the on-going nature of their roles.

5. Did the VTAE instructors and support personnel receive adequate training? (Objective 3)

Instructors were trained primarily by a Wis-Line telephone conference. Those who began their programs after the initial training visited other sites for orientation. None of the local staff said they felt they should have had more training in that most were already trained in Adult Basic Education or English As A Second Language. One said that oral assessment for ESL would be helpful.

Thus, it would appear that the Wis-Line training they received or sought at other sites was minimally adequate. The researcher felt, however, that the instructor group would benefit from more structured opportunities to share their expertise with one another.

6. Were at least 387 job classifications assessed to identify level of basic skills required? (Objective 4)

No. As of March 31, 1990, the number of job classifications assessed was 369, just short of the objective.

7. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in assessing the required number of job classifications? (Objective 4)

Four major factors were cited in at least one site's failure to assess the required number of job classifications. First, the need to shut down temporarily the hazardous operation being evaluated due to safety concerns. That is, the partners feared that a job holder in a hazardous area might become distracted discussing the requirements of the position with the evaluator, and possibly be injured. Thus, it was felt that shut down of the equipment was required and the production schedule did not readily allow it. Second, the company and union's desire that both have a representative accompanying the evaluator limited the time available for the activity. Third, the company does not have formal job descriptions for the evaluator to work from. Finally, the labor dispute at the site had "put the job evaluations on the back burner."

8. Were orientation activities held for at least 14,640 employees at their work-sites? (Objective 5)

Yes. As of March 31, 1990, 15,786 employees had received orientation to the program, according to project records.

9. To what extent were participants made aware of all program services including peer advising, child care, transportation, and opportunities for additional education and skill training? (Objective 5)

All 3 sites visited indicated that the instructor is the major vehicle for helping participants move on to additional training. Eight of 21 participants said that they had or they planned to take additional coursework beyond the Learning Center.

Signs on the availability of child care assistance were posted at all 3 sites. None of the participants said they required either child care or transportation. One site reported it did not have any funds in its budget for transportation and that child care funds for the quarter were \$400.00. In the local partners interview it was not clear how the two line items had been identified.

The preponderance of male participants even at the Weyerhaeuser site, where equal numbers of males and females are employed, raises the question of whether child care may still be a barrier for female participation. Peer advisors at one site suggested that women were, in fact, precluded from participation due to the need to be home when children return from school. Thus, infant and toddler care may not be required as much as after-school options for school age children.

One site reported that a barrier to using existing child care funds is the fact that the care provider must furnish a social security number as many child care providers operate on a cash basis and will not supply their number. The project director indicated subsequently that the project did not require the social security number.

Thus, it appears that child care may be a barrier to greater female participation, however it is after-school responsibilities that are the barrier at least in some companies. A solution would seem to be company sponsored or subsidized day care and/or after school activity centers with necessary transportation.

10. Did at least 13,374 employees receive peer advisement? (Objective 6)

No. As of March 31, 1990, a total of 8,957 employees had received peer advisement. This was an area in which the project obviously was not able to meet its objectives. See "Recommendations."

11. What factors contributed to success or lack of success in peer advising activities? (Objective 6)

One approach that proved unsuccessful was that of designating union stewards, whether they were interested or not, as peer advisors. "The person has got to want to do it," said a local partner.

A successful approach is that of having participants serve as peer advisors. Note that participants themselves said that they found out about the program primarily through printed materials. Only 7 of the 24 responses to this question indicated a union representative or union meeting. This would suggest that the peer advisor program needs to be strengthened to maximize its potential effectiveness. (See "How Participants Found Out About the Program," "Motivation for Enrolling," and "Recommendations.")

12. Were at least 1,317 employees recruited for the project? (Objective 7)

Yes. At the end of March, 1989, 1,441 had been recruited statewide, according to project records.

13. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in recruiting participants? (Objective 7)

One participant summarized the difficulty inherent in recruitment. "Shame is the biggest thing keeping people away. Once they got in, they'd stay in. They'd really like it." A partner said, "Some are scared to come in having done their jobs for 30 years without skills. Now they fear being found out." Other barriers were long shifts, fatigue, and family responsibilities such as the need to pick up and care for children after school.

Successful approaches cited included: open houses; informational orientations; handbills and flyers; materials attached to paychecks; materials on bulletin boards; person-to-person referrals through peer advisors; instructor visits to break room and work stations (for non-readers); word of mouth support of current participants, presentations at union meeting, and the like.

When participants were asked how they found out about the program, the most frequent response was through printed materials. (See "How Participants Found Out About the Program.")

14. Were at least 1,237 participants assessed to determine competencies in reading, verbal and written communications, listening, math, reasoning, problem-solving, and use of the English language? (Objective 8)

Yes. As of March 31, 1990, 1,336 participants had been assessed, according to project records.

15. Was basic skills instruction provided to at least 1,309 employees to retrain them for specific job classifications? (Objective 9)

Yes. As of March 31, 1990, 1,410 participants had received training, according to project records.

16. To what extent was instruction individualized, mediated, competency-based and open-entry/open-exit? (Objective 9)

All three sites visited offered instruction that was individualized, supported by audio-visuals (mediated) competency-based and open-entry/open-exit. Two of the 3 sites offered computer-assisted instruction.

17. Did 61 non-English-speaking employees receive ESL instruction in reading and writing? (Objective 10)

No. As of March 31, 1990, the project had provided ESL instruction to 41 employees, according to project records.

18. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in providing ESL instruction? (Objective 10)

The major factor cited by two of the three sites visited was the absence of employees for whom English is a second language. One site said that less than one percent of their work force is non-English speaking. The second had no one for whom English is a second language.

Two factors were seen as barriers in the site that did have a larger ESL population. The first was the peer pressure that going back to school is not "macho." The second and probably most significant obstacle was the lack of ability to provide promotional presentations in other languages, Spanish, in this case.

19. Did 545 employees prepare for the G.E.D. or engage in activities leading to an adult education diploma or receive career training from the employers, VTAE colleges or other institutions? (Objective 11)

Yes. As of March 31, 1990, 591 employees had received G.E.D. or "other" educational experiences, according to project records.

20. What factors contributed to success or lack of success in providing those additional educational opportunities for the projected number of participants?

(Objective 11)

This question is difficult to answer in that it was inadvertently double-barreled. Many employees were working toward a G.E.D. or "engaging in activities leading to an adult education diploma" at the Learning Center sites. A minority of those interviewed (2) said they had had any additional training since enrolling in the Learning Center. One of those was from a newer program, so program longevity is not the only factor.

One teacher reported being over-extended with lesson-planning, teaching, recruitment, assessment, and counseling. Most of the instructors have other teaching responsibilities beyond their WPL assignments. Greater involvement of VTAE career planning staff would be helpful. But beyond that, all the barriers to participation in WPL apply to attending the local technical college except more so. The added distance and time make it more of a challenge. One participant in the Learning Center said, "I work many hours. I started work at 4:30 a.m. today and finished at 4:00 this afternoon." The addition of more on-site VTAE classes is recommended.

21. Was child care and transportation provided as requested? (Objective 12)

None of those interviewed said they needed either. See question 9.

22. Was the project evaluated on the basis of its objectives? (Objective 13)

This document achieves the objective.

23. To what extent has information on the partnership been disseminated throughout labor, management and technical college organizations throughout the state? (Objective 14)

In-house publications of all three sites included articles on WPL. One site submitted an article to the national publication, the AAACE Journal. Local partners spoke at these conferences:

Wisconsin State Reading Association, 1990.

Economics Development Conference, 1990.

Regional union meetings.

One site reported that so many companies had requested information on the program, that the site organized an open house for other interested companies. That site reports that almost all the twenty or so companies who attended the open house or visited individually now have some kind of literacy program. State level partners reported speaking at a number of regional meetings as well as the following:

- * AFL-CIO State Community Services Conference, Lake Geneva, 1990 and Appleton, 1989.
- * Wisconsin Vocational Association, Stevens Point, 1990.
- * Central Labor Council Conference, 1989.
- * AFL-CIO National Community Services Conference, Washington, D.C., 1989.

Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce placed an article in ALLIANCE, their publication to the educational community, and included articles in five WMC newsletters.

SUMMARY OF PART I EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The project as a whole met and exceeded its numerical objectives to orient employees, recruit, assess, train, and provide educational opportunities for participants.

The project did not meet its numerical objectives for training peer advisors, job assessment, and providing ESL instruction.

Relative to ESL, the major factor cited by two of the three sites visited was the absence of employees for whom English is a second language. One site said that less than one percent of their work force is non-English speaking. The second had no one for whom English is a second language.

Two factors were seen as barriers in the site that did have a larger ESL population. The first was the peer pressure that going back to school is not "macho." The second and probably most significant obstacle was the lack of ability to provide promotional presentations in other languages, Spanish, in this case.

State and local partnerships were judged very effective by the researcher based on interviews. All 3 sites offered instruction that was individualized, mediated, competency-based and open-entry/open exit.

Neither child care nor transportation assistance was required by those interviewed. However, the extent to which child care responsibilities may deter women from enrolling is unknown.

Information on the partnership has been disseminated both throughout the state and nationally by state and local partners.

Instructors felt their training was adequate, however, the researcher felt more formal sharing of experiences and expertise would be of benefit to the instructors.

PART II: PARTICIPANT OUTCOMES

24. What benefits does the program provide the employing organization?

Participants, local partners, and peer advisors agreed that participation results in people being able to work more effectively as a team. The groups also agreed that employers ultimately have more skilled employees. (See "Effects of WPL on the Organization As a Whole.")

One site had climate study data showing that levels of employee trust and communication had increased due to management's commitment to education. Other local partners cited increased trust as well. Many participants found it difficult to respond to forced-choice questions about how the program had affected the total organization. However, of those who did offer an opinion,

three-fourths reported that morale, productivity, quality and relationships among employees had improved "a lot" or "some." Two thirds reported "a lot" or "some" improvement in relationships with supervisors. Local partners agreed that the program increased morale.

The question was also asked in an open-ended format. Then participants suggested, in their own words, that improved quality and productivity were the major benefits accruing to the employer from WPL. One partner said, "When you have the company and the union backing you, it makes for positive feelings and a positive attitude has to help the employer."

All of the local partner groups suggested an additional benefit to employers: WPL helps organizations to adapt to change. One union representative said, "People have gotten by for 30 years with a second grade reading level. Things are changing. [The program] helps people adapt." At another site a partner said, "The program helps in the movement from unskilled to skilled labor. It forces a company to look at technology longer term. It forces a company to identify needed skills and to articulate its future."

In summary, employer benefits of the program reported by respondents include: a more skilled work force; better teamwork, improved quality and productivity; higher levels of trust and communication; increased morale and motivation, and increased ability to adapt to change.

25. What benefits does the program provide for participating employees?

Local partners, peer advisors, and participants agreed that the program improved basic skills. In fact, the majority of participants who reported studying math, reading, writing, speaking, computer or problem solving skills reported "a lot" or "some" improvement.

Local partners agreed that participation increased self-esteem and self confidence. One said, "It increases your self confidence when you don't have to think up excuses to get someone to read something to you -- like you forgot your glasses." Participants supported this indirectly by saying that their greatest gains were in relationships with other employees, promotability, and relationships with supervisors. The gains in relationships were made, many said, because they were no longer reticent to talk to others, to ask questions, or to offer their opinions.

Participants reported as a group that their greatest gains were in improved relationships with other employees, math, promotability, relationships with supervisors, and problem-solving ability. (See Tables I and II.)

Peer advisors interviewed were the most emphatic of the groups about the opportunities for job advancement provided by the program. Most of the local partners also cited job advancement as a benefit. As mentioned earlier, just under half of the participants (10) felt the program had increased their promotability "a lot" or "some."

Participants overwhelmingly said that the program helped them in their personal lives. (See "Effects of Participation on Employees.")

26. What were the demographic characteristics of participants in terms of age, sex, ethnicity, length of employment, highest level of education completed or educational functioning level?

The majority of participants were white males. Of 1,410 participants, 1,133 or 80%, were white. The second largest category, 14%, was "black, not of Hispanic origin" (198 participants). Hispanics, accounted for 5% (65 participants). American Indian/Alaskan Native and Asian/Pacific Islander each accounted for less than 1%, with 7 participants from each group.

Of 1,410 participants, 867, or 61%, were male with 543, or 39%, being female.

In terms of educational functioning, over two-thirds, 69% or 974 participants, had completed or were functioning at the 9th-12th grade levels. Of the remainder, 29% or 402 participants had completed or were functioning at the 0-8th grade levels. Levels for 2%, or 34 participants, were reported as unknown.

Sixty-one percent, or 859, were between ages 25-44. Thirty-one percent, or 442, were between ages 45-59. Five percent, or 69, were between ages 16-24. Less than 1 percent, 5, were 60 and older. For 2 percent, or 35, age was unknown.

27. What was the average number of hours of instruction per week per student?
Data to answer this question were not collected for the project as a whole.

28. What was the major impetus for enrolling in the program?

When participants were asked what factors had the most effect on their decision to enroll, their answers were fairly evenly divided among open house, peer advisor, printed publication and family member suggestion. (See "Motivation for Enrolling.")

29. What were participants' major goals?

Major goals stated by participants included desire to improve math skills and to improve self image. These were closely followed by the desire to improve reading and writing skills and to retain or do better at their current jobs. Just over half said they were interested in a promotion.

For the researcher, an unanticipated outcome was the consistency with which participants cited the desire to improve self image as a goal for enrolling. Almost all of the respondents, 18 out of 21, cited this goal. This desire for improved self image may be able to be addressed in promotional materials, if only obliquely. (See "Personal Goals for Participation.")

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

For future research on the Workplace Partnership Literacy program, the researcher suggests visiting only those sites that have been operational at least nine months and interviewing only those who have been in the program at least six months. This will help ensure that participants have sufficient experience with the program to make judgements about it.

A limitation of this study was the difficulty the researcher experienced attempting to interview the ESL students. The majority of the questions were

not understood by the ESL respondents. Thus, future designs should include a Spanish-speaking interviewer, assuming Spanish is appropriate for the site(s).

Data for participant age and amount of time in the program were collected in intervals for this research. It would be useful to have the data in actual years and months so that means, medians and modes can be calculated. If the design is similar to this one, the relatively small number of participants makes collection of actual numbers feasible.

Finally, just under half of the respondents plan to go on for additional education. Following up on those same employees to determine how many did pursue additional training could provide extremely useful information.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Wisconsin State AFL-CIO, Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, and Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, participating employers, technical college, union locals, and all the individuals at the state and local level involved in the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy Program are commended for their efforts. The commitment to the program at all levels is clearly evident.
2. The 1,410 Wisconsin employees who enrolled in the program are commended for their initiative, desire for self improvement, and willingness to work hard after their regular work hours. Many of these students have overcome great fear, anxiety and other barriers to learn new skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State of Wisconsin should have a strategic plan for the development of workplace literacy programs.

The need for increased literacy in the workforce was the most pressing need identified by Wisconsin employers who testified at the hearing, "Practical Solutions to the Future Workforce Needs of Wisconsin," held by the Wisconsin Council on Vocational Education in 1989.

To insure that the impact of state or federal funds for workplace literacy are maximized, a plan should be in place identifying what agencies or groups should be involved and how their workplace literacy efforts should complement on-going efforts.

In the absence of a plan, efforts may be fragmented and the needs of employers to upgrade worker literacy may go unfulfilled.

2. The peer advisor feature of the program should receive additional attention in that peer advisors appear to be an under-utilized resource in recruitment.

Almost two-thirds of participants interviewed said they had had no contact with union representatives (peer advisors) about the program. It is possible that participants did not recall early contacts with peer advisors. However, peer advisors were cited about as frequently as open houses, printed publications, and family members as having the most effect on participants' decision to enroll. (See "How Participants Found Out About the Program" and "Motivation for Enrolling".) Participants reported that when peer advisors did contact them, it was very helpful.

3. Future WPL program designs should consider the feasibility of after-school transportation and activities for school age children to attempt to raise the female participation rate.

This might be accomplished by establishing a WPL site in a company near an after-school activity site and/or in conjunction with on-going projects that include after school activities.

Peer advisors at one site said the need to pick up children from school accounted for the lack of female participation in the program. Over all, the female participation rate for WPL is lower than for males.

EPILOGUE

The WPL participants were interviewed in February and March, 1990. As an expression of thanks for giving up their study time, the researcher gave each interviewee a pen. At the conclusion of one interview, the man read from the package, "ballpoint pen." He repeated "ballpoint pen" and said, "When I came here last August, I could not read those words."

LOCAL PARTNERS
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM

Administered by
PARIS and ASSOCIATES
Madison, Wisconsin

Interviewer _____ Date _____

Location _____

1. A responsibility of the State Board of VTAE has been to provide training for instructors and support personnel. Was the training provided? [Objective 3]

2. Please describe the training provided to peer advisors. [Objective 2] [Attach documentation]

3. This project has met/exceeded/not been able to meet its goal for number of employees receiving peer advising. What accounts for the success/difficulty in providing peer advising to the projected number of employees? [Objective 6]

4. This project has met/exceeded/not be able to meet its goal for number of job classifications assessed to determine baseline competencies. What accounts for the success/difficulty in completing the required number of job classification assessments? [Objective 4]

5a. Describe orientation activities provided to employees. [Objective 5] [Attach samples]

5b. Was an informational meeting held at each worksite to explain the services of the program? [Objective 5]

6. Describe the successes and difficulties you encountered in recruiting participants for the program. [Objective 7]

7a. What do you do to ensure that participants know about all the services available to them through the program?

7b. Do you have a participant activity flow-chart or formal list of activities for the program beginning with intake? [Attach sample]

8a. How do you ensure that every employee is assessed to determine basic competencies in reading, verbal and written communication, listening, mathematics, reasoning and problem-solving, and use of the English language? [Objective 8]

8b. Are employee assessment results recorded and available for review?

9. Is there evidence that instruction [Objective 9] provided is:

a. Individualized? Yes _____ No _____ NOJ _____ *

Comments: _____

b. Mediated? Yes _____ No _____ NOJ _____ *

Comments: _____

c. Competency-based? Yes _____ No _____ NOJ _____ *

Comments: _____

d. Computer-assisted? Yes _____ No _____ NOJ _____ *

Comments: _____

e. Open-entry/open exit? Yes _____ No _____ NOJ _____ *

*NOJ means No Opportunity to Judge

10. This project has met/exceeded/not been able to meet its goals for providing ESL reading and writing instruction for non-English-speaking workers. What accounts for the success/difficulty in providing ESL to the projected number of employees? [Objective 10]

11. This project has met/exceeded/not been able to meet its goals for providing opportunities for workers to prepare for the G.E.D. test or other adult education or training. What accounts for the success/difficulty in providing the projected number of employees with those educational opportunities? [Objective 11]

12. How do participants "move" from the literacy training provided by the project to educational opportunities such as G.E.D. testing or other adult education and training? [Objective 11]

13. To what extent are child care and transportation requested by participants? [Objective 12]

14a. The WPL project was proposed as a partnership between the local technical college, the employer, and the union (or employee representatives). How effectively is the partnership functioning here? [Objective 1]

14b. Are the roles of the partners clear?

15. Please describe how you have disseminated information on the partnership to labor, management, and the technical colleges in Wisconsin. [Objective 14]

16a. What specific benefits does the program provide to the employer?

16b. How can these benefits be measured?

17a. What specific benefits does the program provide for the employees?

17b. How can these benefits be measured?

PARTICIPANTS
LOCAL PARTNERS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM

Project Location _____ Date _____

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____	_____
12.	_____	_____	_____

FINAL VERSION

PARTICIPANTS
INTERVIEW SCRIPT AND SCHEDULE
WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM

Administered by
PARIS and ASSOCIATES
Madison, Wisconsin

Interviewer: _____ Date _____

Location: _____

SCRIPT

My name is Kathleen Paris and I am writing a report on how well the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy Program is working around the State. I am talking to a lot of people involved in the program--teachers, peer advisors, employers, union reps, and probably most importantly, the employees. I would like to talk to you about your experiences with the program, if that's agreeable to you. It's completely voluntary on your part and everything you say will be confidential. By that I mean all employee opinions will be reported anonymously. No one outside of myself will know who said what. The interview takes less than half an hour. If you do agree to having me interview you, you will receive a pen as a small thank-you for your time. Would you be willing to talk to me about the program?

If "yes", proceed to Informed Consent Form and question 1

If "no", say "Thank you anyway."

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

PART I

1. What is your job title? _____
2. How long have you been going to the [Education Center]?
 - a. ____ A month or less
 - b. ____ More than 1 month, but less than 3 months
 - c. ____ More than 3 months, but less than 6
 - d. ____ More than 6 months [go to e.] e. How long? _____
3. I will read a list of things that encourage people to enroll in the Learning Center. After I have read the list, I will ask you which one(s) had the most effect on your deciding to enroll.

a. ____ Peer advisor	e. ____ Another training program
b. ____ Employer referred me	f. ____ Printed publication
c. ____ Attended an open house	g. ____ Other (Please specify)
d. ____ Family member suggested it	_____
- "Which of those had the most effect on your deciding to enroll in the Learning Center?"
4. I will read a list of goals people typically want to accomplish in the Learning Center. After I have read the list, I will ask you what your goals are for enrolling.

a. ____ Improve math skills	h. ____ Transfer to different job
b. ____ Improve writing skills	i. ____ Improve self-image
c. ____ Improve reading skills	j. ____ ESL instruction
d. ____ Improve spoken communications skill	k. ____ Other (Please specify)
e. ____ Retain job	_____
f. ____ Do better at current job	
g. ____ Receive a promotion	

"What are your goals for enrolling in the Learning Center?"

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

5. So far, which of the following areas have you worked on in the [Education Center]?

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. ☐ Math skills | f. ☐ Computer literacy skills |
| b. ☐ Reading skills | g. ☐ GED Preparation |
| c. ☐ Writing skills | h. ☐ Other (Please specify) |
| d. ☐ English language skills | |
| e. ☐ Spoken communication skills | |

Comments: _____

6. About how many hours do you spend in the [Education Center] in a typical week?

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. ☐ Less than 1 hour | e. ☐ More than 4 hours
(go to f.) |
| b. ☐ Between 1-2 hours | f. How many? _____ |
| c. ☐ Up to 3 hours | |
| d. ☐ Up to 4 hours | |

Comments: _____

7. Is the amount of time you spend in the [Education Center]

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| a. ☐ Too much? | b. ☐ About right? | c. ☐ Not enough? |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|

Comments: _____

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

8. About how many hours do you spend on "homework" in a typical week?

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. ☐ An hour or less | d. ☐ Up to 4 hours |
| b. ☐ Between 1-2 hours | e. ☐ More than 4 hours
(go to f.) |
| c. ☐ Up to 3 hours | f. How many? <input type="text"/> |

Comments:

9. Is the amount of time you spend on "homework" each week

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| a. ☐ Too much? | b. ☐ Just right? | c. ☐ Not enough? |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|

Comments:

10. I will read a short list of learning methods and will then ask you which method you like best. You can choose more than one.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. ☐ One-on-one with the teacher | d. ☐ Computer-based |
| b. ☐ 6-8 week group classes | e. ☐ Video |
| c. ☐ Small group discussions | |

"Which of these methods of learning do you like best?"

Comments:

11a. Since going to the [Education Center], have you or do you plan to enroll in any other training programs?

- ☐ No [Go to 12]
- ☐ Yes, I have [Go to 11b.]
- ☐ Yes, I plan to [Go to 11b.]

11b. What programs and where?

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

PART II

Interviewer: For the next group of questions, please answer
 "A lot," "Some," "A Little," "None," "Don't Know," or "Not Applicable."

12. How much do you feel that going to the [Education Center] has improved your:

- | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. Relationships with other employees? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| b. Relationships with Your supervisors? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| c. Productivity on the job? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| d. Safety on the job? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| e. Promotability? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| f. Attendance at work? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| g. Satisfaction with your job? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| h. Quality of work? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| i. Math skills? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| j. Reading skills? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| k. Writing skills? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| l. Ability to use computers? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| m. Ability to communicate by speaking? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |
| n. Ability to solve problems? | ☐ A lot | ☐ Some | ☐ A Little | ☐ None | ☐ DK | ☐ NA |

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

13a. Is English your second language? ☐ Yes [go to 13b.]

☐ No [go to 14]

13b. How much do you feel the [Education Center] has improved your ability to speak English?

☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

Comments: _____

14. Do you wish to comment on any of the questions we just covered?

Comments: _____

15. These next questions are about [site] as a whole. How much do you think that the [Education Center] has helped to improve:

a. Morale at [site]? ☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

b. Productivity at [site]? ☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

c. Safety at [site]? ☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

d. Quality of work at [site]? ☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

e. Relationships with supervisors at [site]? ☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

f. Relationships between employees at [site] ☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

g. Do you wish to comment on any of the questions we just covered?

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

16. Over all, how much has going to the [Education Center] helped you in your job?

☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ A Little ☐ None ☐ DK ☐ NA

Comments: _____

17. In terms of job promotions, which one of these 4 statements best describes your situation since you got into the program?

- a. ☐ I have been promoted
- b. ☐ I think I will be promoted if there's a job opening
- c. ☐ I don't think I will be promoted
- d. ☐ I don't know

Comments: _____

18. How much has going to the [Education Center] helped you in your personal life?

☐ A lot ☐ Some ☐ Little or none ☐ Don't Know

Comments: _____

19. What benefits does your employer get from your being in the program?

20. How would you describe your instructor in the Learning Center?

- a. ☐ Very Helpful b. ☐ Helpful c. ☐ Somewhat Helpful d. ☐ Not Helpful

Comments: _____

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

21. Which one of these describes your instructor in the Learning Center?

- a. ☐ Easy to understand b. ☐ Somewhat easy to understand c. ☐ Not easy to understand

Comments: _____

22. How would you describe contacts with peer advisors?

- a. ☐ Very Helpful b. ☐ Helpful c. ☐ Somewhat Helpful d. ☐ Not Helpful
e. ☐ Don't Know

Comments: _____

23. Please describe what kind of contact you have had with peer advisors.

24. How did you find out about the program? _____

25a. Do you need child care in order to come to the Learning Center?

- ☐ Yes [go to 25b.] ☐ No [go to 26a.]

Comments: _____

25b. Has the program provided the child care you need?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments: _____

26a. Do you need transportation in order to come to the Learning Center?

- ☐ Yes [go to 26b.] ☐ No [go to 27.]

Comments: _____

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

26b. Has the program provided the transportation you need?

Comments: _____

27. Think about the number of tests you have taken at the [Education Center]. Is the amount:

a. ___ Too much b. ___ About right c. ___ Not enough d. ___ Don't Know

Comments: _____

28a. Do you think the tests have been fair?

a. ___ Yes [go to 29] b. ___ No [go to 28b.] c. ___ Don't Know [go to 28b]

28b. Can you explain why? _____

29. What things do you like most about the [Education Center]? _____

30. What things do you like least about the [Education Center]? _____

PART III

Please provide the following information about yourself:

31. What is your age?

a. ___ Under 18

d. ___ 40-49

g. ___ 70 and over

b. ___ 18-29

e. ___ 50-59

c. ___ 30-39

f. ___ 60-69

WPL PARTICIPANT SURVEY, continued

32. Sex? a. ☐ Male b. ☐ Female

33. Ethnic Background?

- a. ☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native
- b. ☐ Black/Not Hispanic Origin
- c. ☐ White/Not Hispanic Origin
- d. ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
- e. ☐ Hispanic

Thank you very much for sharing your opinions. Your ideas will be very helpful to me in writing the report.

Participant _____

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned, agree to be interviewed by Dr. Kathleen Paris for an evaluation report of the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy program.

It is my understanding that my opinions will be kept confidential and will be reported only in grouped information.

Employee: _____ Date: _____

PEER ADVISORS
INTERVIEW SCRIPT AND SCHEDULE
WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM
Administered by
PARIS and ASSOCIATES
Madison, Wisconsin

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Site: _____

SCRIPT

My name is Kathleen Paris and I am writing a report on how well the Wisconsin Workplace Partnership Literacy Program is working around the State. I am talking to a lot of people involved in the program--peer advisors, teachers, employers, union reps, and participating employees.

I would like to get your thoughts on the program through this short survey. It is completely voluntary on your part and everything you say will be confidential. By that I mean that all opinions will be reported anonymously. No one outside myself will know who said what.

The survey form takes about 15 minutes to complete. I hope you will all complete it as you have a very unique role in the program and a perspective on it that no one else has. However, if you do not want to complete it, simply write a sentence on the front page of the survey form indicating that you do not wish to participate in the survey and return it to me.

Do you have any questions before you begin?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What benefits to employees have you observed as a result of the program?

PEER ADVISORS SURVEY

2. What problems for employees have you observed as a result of the program?

3a. Think about the employees you work with and without using names, describe what, if any, "success" stories come to mind.

3b. For each/the success story(ies) you mentioned, what factors do you think account for the success?

4. How important do you feel each component listed below is to a successful workplace literacy program?

a. Learning Center On-Site

☐ Very Important	☐ Not Important
☐ Important	☐ Don't Know
☐ Somewhat Important	

Comments:

b. Confidential Instruction

☐ Very Important	☐ Not Important
☐ Important	☐ Don't Know
☐ Somewhat Important	

Comments:

PEER ADVISORS SURVEY

c. Individualized Instruction

_____ Very Important _____ Not Important
_____ Important _____ Don't Know
_____ Somewhat Important

Comments: _____

d. Group Workshops or Group Instruction

_____ Very Important _____ Not Important
_____ Important _____ Don't Know
_____ Somewhat Important

Comments: _____

e. Peer Advisors

_____ Very Important _____ Not Important
_____ Important _____ Don't Know
_____ Somewhat Important

Comments: _____

f. Work-Related Instruction

_____ Very Important _____ Not Important
_____ Important _____ Don't Know
_____ Somewhat Important

Comments: _____

g. Voluntary Participation

_____ Very Important _____ Not Important
_____ Important _____ Don't Know
_____ Somewhat Important

Comments: _____

PEER ADVISORS SURVEY

5. What benefits to the organization have you observed as a result of the program?

6. What problems for the organization have you observed as a result of the program?

7. Is there anything else about the program you would like to mention?

8. How long have you been a WPL peer advisor?

a. _____ 1 month or less

b. _____ More than 1 month, but less than 3 months

c. _____ 3 to 6 months

d. _____ More than 6 months (Please indicate how long: _____)

You answers will be reported only as grouped information, so you will not be able to be identified, but may I have your name for my own records?

Peer Advisor: _____

Thank you very much for sharing your opinions. Your ideas will be very helpful to me in writing the report.

STATE PARTNERS
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM
Administered by
PARIS and ASSOCIATES
Madison, Wisconsin

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

State Partner: _____

Title: _____

1. What has your role been in the Wisconsin Workplace Literacy Program?

2. What do you think are the program's strengths?

3. How effective do you think the partnership is at the state level between the Wisconsin Board of VTAE, the Wisconsin Association of Manufacturers and Commerce, and the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO?

4. How has your organization or agency disseminated information on the partnership?

5. What opportunities do you see for improving the program?

6. Are there other comments you wish to make?

SUPERVISORS
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY PROGRAM

1a. Supervisor's Name: _____ 1b. Title _____

2a. Name of Company: _____ 2b. Phone _____

3. Employee's Name: _____

4. How long have you supervised this employee? _____ year(s) _____ months

5. During the past year how would you characterize the employee's over all job performance?

a. _____ Greatly Improved b. _____ Improved c. _____ Somewhat Improved

d. _____ Greatly Worsened e. _____ Worsened f. _____ Somewhat Worsened

g. _____ No Change Comments: _____

6. How would you characterize changes in the employee's performance in the last year relative to:

a. Math skills?

b. Writing Skills?

_____ Greatly Improved

_____ Greatly Improved

_____ Improved

_____ Improved

_____ Somewhat Improved

_____ Somewhat Improved

_____ No Change

_____ No Change

_____ Somewhat Worsened

_____ Somewhat Worsened

_____ Worsened

_____ Worsened

_____ Greatly Worsened

_____ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

Comments:

WPL SUPERVISORS SURVEY

Question 6 continued

How would you characterize changes in the employee's performance in the last year relative to:

c. Reading Skills?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

d. Productivity?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

e. Safety?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

f. Quality?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

WPL SUPERVISORS SURVEY

Question 6 continued

How would you characterize changes in the employee's performance in the last year relative to:

g. Promotability?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

h. Attendance?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

i. Relationship to Supervisors?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

j. Relationship to Employees?

- ☐ Greatly Improved
- ☐ Improved
- ☐ Somewhat Improved
- ☐ No Change
- ☐ Somewhat Worsened
- ☐ Worsened
- ☐ Greatly Worsened

Comments:

k. Other changes you have noticed in the past year? _____

WPL SUPERVISORS SURVEY

7. During the past year has the number of grievances (if any) submitted by the employee

☐ Increased? ☐ Decreased? ☐ Remained the Same? ☐ Not Applicable

Comments: _____

8. Do you feel that any of the changes you noted in questions 5, 6, and 7 were the result of participation in the Workplace Partnership Literacy program?

☐ Don't Know ☐ No ☐ Yes [Please specify below which one(s)]

9. Can you describe any actions or behaviors of this employee that attest to positive benefits of the WPL program?

10. Only if applicable, suggest factors that could account for this employee's lack of improvement in spite of participation in the program?

11. Please add other comments you wish to make about the program:

12. What items, if any, did you find difficult to answer on this survey form or how might the survey instrument be improved? _____

Thank you very much for sharing your opinions. Your feedback and suggestions will be very helpful to the evaluation report!

WISCONSIN WORKPLACE PARTNERSHIP LITERACY (WPL) PROGRAM
THIRD PARTY EVALUATION SCHEDULE
Kathleen Paris -- Evaluator

**Navistar International Transportation Corporation--WPL Participant/Supervisor
Interview Field Test**

DATE: January 11, 1990 (Thursday)
TIME: 3:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
ACTIVITY: Participant/Supervisor Interviews (3 each)
CONTACT: Sherry Noe, Waukesha County Technical College Instructor
SITE: Navistar International Transportation Corporation
1401 Perkins Avenue, Waukesha
(414) 548-1600

Briggs & Stratton Corporation--WPL Program Evaluation

DATE: January 29, 1990 (Monday)
TIME: 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
ACTIVITY: Roundtable Discussion
PARTICIPANTS: Diane Holbrook, Supervisor - Educational Services
Briggs & Stratton
Alan Karch, Vice President of Local 232, Allied Industrial
Workers, Briggs & Stratton (Peer Advisor)
Pat Wolf, Associate Dean - General Education
Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC)
Fran Romans, Instructor, MATC
Peter Zimmer, Instructor, MATC
SITE: Briggs & Stratton Corporation, Corporate Office Building
12301 Wirth Street, Wauwatosa
(414) 259-5460

DATE: January 30, 1990 (Tuesday)
TIME: 3:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
ACTIVITY: WPL Participant Interviews (12 total)
SITE: Briggs & Stratton Corporation

DATE: January 31, 1990 (Wednesday)
TIME: 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m., 11:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.,
and 3:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. (if necessary)
ACTIVITY: WPL Participant Interviews (12 total)
SITE: Briggs & Stratton Corporation

Meyerhaeuser Company--WPL Program Evaluation

DATE: February 6, 1990 (Tuesday)
TIME: 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon
ACTIVITY: Roundtable Discussion
PARTICIPANTS: Tim Lockhardt, Training and Development Specialist,
Architectural Door Division, Meyerhaeuser Company
Sandy Moen, President, United Brotherhood of Carpenters
& Joiners of America, Local 1733 (Peer Advisor)
Bill Lindroth, GOAL Coordinator, Mid-State
Technical College (MSTC)
Cathy Schnabel, Instructor, MSTC

SITE: Weyerhaeuser Company, Architectural Door Division,
1401 East 4th Street, Marshfield
(715) 384-2141 ext. 407

DATE: February 6, 1990 (Tuesday)
TIME: 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
ACTIVITY: WPL Participant and Peer Advisor Interviews (5 each--total)
SITE: Weyerhaeuser Company

Miller Compressing Company--WPL Program Evaluation

DATE: March 29, 1990 (Thursday)
TIME: 12:00 noon - 2:00 p.m.
ACTIVITY: Roundtable Discussion
PARTICIPANTS: Carol Thomas, Manager of Human Resources, Miller Compressing
Company
William Reik, President of Local 364, Allied Industrial
Workers (Peer Advisor)
Pat Wolf, Associate Dean-General Education, Milwaukee Area
Technical College (MATC)
Sally Thomsen, Instructor, MATC

SITE: Miller Compressing Company
1640 West Bruce Street, Milwaukee
(414) 671-5980

DATE: March 29, 1990 (Thursday)
TIME: 2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
ACTIVITY: WPL Peer Advisor Interviews (4 each--total)
SITE: Miller Compressing Company

DATE: March 29, 1990 (Thursday)
TIME: 3:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
ACTIVITY: WPL Participant Interviews (4 each--total)
SITE: Miller Compressing Company

DM:SNU
217/Rpt/15

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation questions have been grouped into two categories. Part I includes questions directly tied to project objectives. Part II includes questions relative specifically to participant outcomes.

PART I, PROJECT OBJECTIVES (Questions 1-23)

QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCE
1. How effective are the local partnerships between the technical colleges, the employers, and the unions (or employee representatives)? (objective 1)	Local Partners Interviews
2. How effective is the partnership at the state level between the WBVTAE, Wisconsin Association of Manufacturers and Commerce and the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO? (Objective 1)	Interviews with State Partners
3. Were at least 623 union or employee representatives trained as peer advisors? (Objective 2)	Project Records
4. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in training peer advisors? (Objective 2)	Local Partner Interviews
5. Did the VTAE instructors and support personnel receive adequate training? personnel at local technical colleges? (Objective 3)	Local Partner Interviews Project Director

6. Were at least 197 job classifications assessed to identify level of basic skills required?

Project Records

7. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in assessing the required number of job classifications? (Objective 4)

Local Partner Interviews

8. Were orientation activities held for at least 15,549 employees at their worksites? (Objective 5)

Project Records

9. To what extent were participants made aware of all program services including peer advising, child care, transportation, and opportunities for additional education and skill training? (Objective 5)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

10. Did at least 9329 participants receive peer advisement? (Objective 6)

Project Records

11. What factors contributed to success or lack of success in peer advising activities? (Objective 6)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

12. Were at least 1664 employees enrolled in the project? (Objective 7)

Project Records

13. What factors contributed to the success or lack success in recruiting participants? (Objective 7)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

14. Where all recruited participants assessed to determine competencies in reading, verbal and written communications, listening, math, reasoning, problem-solving, and use of the English language? (Objective 8)

Local Partner Interviews
Intake Forms
Participant Interviews

15. Was basic skills instruction provided to at least 1554 employees to retrain them for specific job classifications? (Objective 9)

Project Records

16. To what extent was instruction individualized, mediated, competency-based and open-entry/open-exit? (objective 9)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

17. Did 110 non-English-speaking employees receive ESL instruction in reading and writing? (Objective 10)

Project Records

18. What factors contributed to the success or lack of success in providing ESL instruction? (Objective 10)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

19. Did 777 employees prepare for the G.E.D. or engage in activities leading to an adult education diploma or receive career training from the employers, VTAE colleges or other institutions? (Objective 11)

Project Records

20. What factors contributed to success or lack of success in providing those additional educational opportunities for the projected number of participants? (Objective 11)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

21. Was child care and transportation provided as requested? (Objective 12)

Local Partner Interviews
Participant Interviews

22. Was the project evaluated on the basis of its objectives? (Objective 13)

Submission of evaluation
report by third party
evaluator

23. To what extent has information on the partnership been disseminated throughout labor, management and technical college organizations throughout the state? (Objective 14)

Local Partner Interviews
Project Director
State Partners

PART II. PARTICIPANT OUTCOMES
(Questions 24-30)

24. What benefits does the program provide the employing organization?

Local Partner Interviews
Project Director
Employee Interviews

25. What benefits does the program provide for participating employees?

Local Partner Interviews
Project Director
Employee Interviews

26. What were the demographic characteristics of participants in terms of age, sex, ethnicity, length of employment, highest level of education completed or educational functioning level?

Project Records

27. What was the average number of hours of instruction per week per student?

Project Records

28. What was the major impetus for enrolling in the program?

Participant Interviews

29. What were participants' major goals?

Participant Interviews

10. Which methods of learning do you like best?

Comments:

- (4) [One-on-one with the teacher] Because I know she's going to spend the whole time with me.
- (5) [OK] Haven't been exposed to most of them. We've just done one-to-ones.
- (6) [One-on-one with the teacher] Only one other guy where I am in Algebra book.
- (12) Would like more one-on-one. If a person isn't as good at something and gets stuck a lot, one-on-one is best. There's always too many students for the teachers. I thought, at first, I'd have my own tutor.
- (14) [One-on-one with the teacher] Don't always have access to the teacher. They were overwhelmed by people at first. Quite a few dropped out so it's better now.
- (17) "I'm allergic to typing and computers".

11 a., b. Since going to the [Education Center], have you or do you plan to enroll in any other training program?

Comments:

- (1) [Maybe] For now, this program is better for me. If I had to go home, eat and then go to school - I wouldn't - especially in the winter.
- (2) [O.K.] When you work 10-11 hours, it's hard.
- (4) [O.K.] The hours I work make it hard. Here it's easy because we come right straight from work.
14. Do you wish to comment on any of the questions we just covered?

Comments:

- (5) I was a drop-out. I did try school a few years back in Chicago. I was thrown in a group; couldn't keep up with it. Here we start out at our own level.
- (8) I'm setting goals for myself. I want to keep up with the rest of them. I might not be able to if they go more mod. than what they are.
- (10) I still have the same job and I work with the same people.

APPENDIX I

15 g. Do you wish to comment on any of the questions we just covered?

Comments:

(20) People can't work all day - 8 hours - and then go to class 8 hours - especially with families.

16. Overall, how much has going to the [Education Center] helped you in your job?

Comments:

(5) [Some] Because of self-confidence.

(7) [Some] Feel more self-confident.

(13) [A lot] I'm more inquisitive, more confident.

(15) [A little] There are times when the computer help really helped me understand the computers on my job.

(17) [A lot] I've got an hour of paperwork to do daily; It's really helped me with that.

(20) [A lot] Before they'd say, "You don't have to know that". Now they think we know what you're talking about.

(21) [A little] I understand what's involved more.

17. In terms of job promotions, which one of these four (4) statements best describes your situation since you got into the program?

Comments:

(1) [I think I will be...] It depends. There's more chance for me now.

(5) [N.A.] I'm not looking for a promo. I'm in labor grade 1. If they eliminate my job I would need this ed. to have a chance at the job.

(6) [I don't think I will...] I've had this job since '62; I wouldn't want to go salaried. I'd like to stay in Union. With layoffs, I feel more secure being in Union.

(8) [N.A.] Promotion not a goal. How can you get promoted around here?

18. How much has going to the [Education Center] helped you in your personal life?

Comments:

- (1) [A lot] When I go to the store, they know what I want. Before it was not so good.
- (2) [A lot] You can do a lot of things you didn't know how to do like pay your bills, fill out money orders.
- (4) [A lot] Sometimes when I go to the store and I need something, or have to speak to somebody.
- (5) [Some] I can read and understand what I read better.
- (6) [Some] The wife has looked at my books - boys too have asked questions.
- (8) [A lot] I can pick up a newspaper and read it. I can help my little girls with their reading to sound out words.
- (9) [A lot] Helped with p.m. school.
- (11) [A lot] I'm happier about myself. I'm so happy because I did it.
- (12) [Some] Took math problems home. Grocery bills - I'm a little better with the pocketbook, I keep a tally in my head.
- (13) [A lot] Am able to work with my kids on homework - they help me too.
- (14) [A lot] I'm more confident, aggressive. Am not so intimidated by others.
- (15) [Some] I don't plan to be here forever. A computer will help me a lot in starting a family business.
- (17) [A lot] My ability to communicate with others, thinking of people more. When people ask for help, I help them because people here have taken time to help me.
- (19) [A lot] Got my priorities in order.
- (20) [O.K.] It's made home-life hectic.

APPENDIX I

19. What benefits does your employer get from your being in the program?

Comments:

- (3) We're safer, can read all the signs.
- (5) At this time maybe I can handle the job better and in the future also. Better quality and productivity - it all goes together.
- (6) Quite a bit - with these new machines, can solve problems better and faster. The reading skills would help in that too.
- (7) You do a better job if you know what you're doing.
- (8) A) Fewer mistakes.
B) Understand what I'm doing more - helps control waste.
C) Make product right the first time around.
- (9) Don't know.
- (10) "Know that I know more about math, gauges".
- (11) My knowledge will help on my job. I'll give them 100%.
- (12) Can only benefit greatly by having people learn. It all helps the life at the factory.
- (13) More contented person.
- (15) Could help me in my job.
- (17) Better work out of me. I solve more of my own problems; am more conscientious of the work I do.
- (18) None. I'm trying to improve my image and self-esteem.
- (19) Makes me more motivated. Before I came to L.C., I was in a rut, thought I'd be here forever. Now I know I have to prepare myself.
- (20) Person has more marketable skills. I'm a more valuable employee because I have more knowledge.
- (21) Better quality work.

20. How would you describe your instructor in the learning center?Comments:

- (1) [Very helpful] Nice teacher; nice person. She tries to help everyone.
- (8) [Very helpful] If I don't understand something, she straightens it out.
- (12) [Very helpful] In the limited time she could spend with each person, she continually gave you praise. She would boost you - if you've had a hard day over there, it really helps.
- (19) [Very helpful] All have been very helpful if you have a problem. They make an honest effort to help, you don't feel like a moron.
- (20) [Very helpful] She's a sweetheart.

21. Which one of these describes your instructor in the learning center?Comments:

- (1) [N.A.] Question not understood.
- (4) [Easy to understand] She takes time to explain to us.
- (16) [Easy to understand] I wish they wouldn't change teachers so much. You get used to one and then they change.
- (19) [Easy to understand] Always happy to go over things with you.

22. How would you describe contacts with peer advisors?Comments:

- (1) [N.A.] Question not understood
- (3) Hopeless [not helpful]
- (7) [N.A.] They didn't.
- (8) [N.A.] Hadn't talked to one.
- (13) [N.A.] Don't see him.
- (17) [D.K.] Not familiar with peer advisor.

SUBJECT AREAS WORKED ON IN LEARNING CENTER

Respondents were asked which areas they had worked on in the Learning Center.

Their answers ranged as follows.

<u>Subject Areas Worked On</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
Math skills	15
Reading skills	14
Writing skills	12
Computer literacy skills	12
English language skills	9
Spoken communication skills	6
GED preparation	1
Other	8

"Other" responses were: blueprint reading (3); gauges (3); micrometers (1); and spelling (1).

Respondents, therefore, appear to be receiving the kinds of instruction they enrolled for. Although computer skills were mentioned as an initial goal by only 4, in fact, over half, 12, have received instruction in computer literacy.

PREFERRED LEARNING METHODS

Respondents were asked what learning method(s) they liked best. Following is a summary of their responses.

<u>Learning Method</u>	<u>Number Responding</u>
One-on-one with teacher	19
Small group discussions	10
6-8 week group classes	4
Computer-based	4
Video	3
Don't know	1

23. Please describe what kind of contact you have had with peer advisors.

Comments:

- (1) [N.A.] Question not understood.
- (7) Meeting in department.
- (8) None.
- (9) Put up notice on board.
- (10) Heard about program, but also heard from other source.
- (16) Everyone in the shop he talked to.
- (18) Told me about it.
- (19) Told about program.
- (20) It helps that she's in the program to recruit others.
- (21) Through talking -- where to go and what's involved.

24. How did you find out about the program?

Comments:

- (1) Union.
- (3) Supervisor told me.
- (4) Union rep.
- (5) People on floor and union member answered questions.
- (6) Randomly selected. Some people to take test on mech, math, reading found out grade/competency levels.
- (7) I was afraid to come. I didn't want them to know how dumb I was - was mentioned at union meetings.
- (8) Letter.
- (9) Posted on bulletin.

APPENDIX I

- (11) Publication with checks.
- (13) Union.
- (15) Flyer.
- (16) Union paper, then union steward.
- (17) Read it in union paper; specified only certain depts. Most of us not in "chosen" depts. Went to grievance.
- (18) Flyer and union steward.
- (19) Bulletin about O.A.
- (21) Bulletin board, letter on check.
- 27. Think about the number of tests you have taken at the [Education Center].

Comments:

- (3) [About right] It's not too much; I can understand.
- (14) [N.A.] Haven't had any.
- (19) [Not enough] Need more to know where I am.
- (20) [Not enough] I could use more verbal tests on computer skills.

29. What things do you like most about the [Education Center]?

Comments:

- (1) Reading, speaking, friends (the same people come every day).
- (2) Computer.
- (3) A) Reading.
B) The fact that the teacher gives me the answers.
- (4) Teacher - because she takes time to explain when we don't understand. She says, "If I say something you don't understand, tell me so I can explain it".

APPENDIX I

- (5) A) Start out where you left off in your education.
B) It's handy - you get off work and go to class.
C) I like the small group. It's pretty darn nice.
- (6) A) Instructor.
B) Algebra Book - it illustrates things well.
- (7) It's a good feeling when you learn something. It makes you proud of yourself.
- (8) Reading.
- (9) I can come and study night school work - get help with math.
- (10) A) Being able to come here to study. If I had to do it at home, I wouldn't do it.
B) That they have it. If you need help, they give it to you.
- (11) A) I like how handy it is - close to work.
B) Hours set up for shifts.
C) Great apps. for us.
- (12) A) Wide variety of apparatus/fields you can study. There are different aspects of math, computers, resume, writing, communicating.
B) Instructors.
- (13) A) I enjoy everything I am doing. I hope it sticks around.
- (14) A) No pressure.
B) Teachers.
C) Relaxed atmosphere - can work at own pace.
- (15) A) Convenient.
B) Have a lot of programs that are helpful (good variety).
- (16) Reading, writing, math.
- (17) Feeling it gives me after I've been here that I'm accomplishing something. Ability to learn. The only problem is there's so much in there I want to conquer.
- (18) They taught me how to improve my self-image by helping me out with math, reading, writing, and computers. Teachers are very friendly toward you.
- (19) They allow you to learn at own speed. Instructors willing to explain things to you; willing to spend extra time with you if they have to.

- (20) A) Closeness to work.
B) I'm glad they are open 3 days.
C) All instructors are real thorough, real interested in the people learning.
- (21) A) Books - very self-explanatory.
B) Helpfulness of teacher.

30. What things do you like least about the [Education Center]?

Comments:

- (1) I like everything.
- (4) I like everything.
- (5) I don't feel comfortable sitting with someone at the same table - would be nice to have more individual study areas. I can't concentrate - especially for spelling.
- (7) Story problems in math.
- (9) No coffee!
- (11) A) Availability of teachers. "Some people left the L.C. because they got frustrated."
B) Computer classes too big (only have 4 people - not doubled up at computer).
- (12) A) A day when I couldn't get on the computers - more are needed.
B) Need more teachers. If there are 12 people for 1 teacher, it's a problem.
C) Screens are hard to read on computers.
- (15) A) Availability of computers.
B) Could use more teachers for one-on-one.
- (17) No clock.
- (19) Have tendency to appeal to lowest common denominator, although teachers are willing to customize.
- (20) A) Not enough hours.
B) Not enough computers.
C) Noise level is a problem. Workshops going on at same time.
- (21) Lack of communication. Between teacher and students - I've come 2 weeks in a row expecting to have class. There's no teacher.